

POINT 75-00, N.Y.

ARGUS

10, 1962

10 1962

CPYRGHT CPYRGHT

## Argues Strongly Against Demands For Military Action Against Cuba

The Daily Argus:

POLITICS and news sensationalism are descending to their vilest depths when they raise spectres of dangers from Cuba so great as to call for immediate military invasion. The hotbloods and politicians who are trying to force the Administration's hands do not realize that they are unwittingly playing Khrushchev's game.

James P. Warburg, an eminent student and writer on foreign affairs stated in a recent pamphlet "Cuba—Time for Restraint and Fortitude" the following:

"The truth is that Khrushchev does not care a fig for Castro or Cuba. They are merely pawns in his game. What he wants is to demoralize the hemisphere, discredit the United States and to provide himself with an excuse for an aggressive short-of-war adventure in Berlin or elsewhere. What he hopes is that, in an election year, taunts of 'indecision' and 'lack of courage' may goad the President into falling into the nicely prepared Cuban trap."

THE PROPONENTS of quick intervention justify it on several grounds — enforcing the Monroe Doctrine, Cuba is a military threat, Castro is out to communize Central and South America. All of these grounds deserve some understanding beyond the commonly prevailing superficial aspects and figures of speech.

The Monroe Doctrine is no longer in existence, for all practical purposes, having been dissolved voluntarily by the U.S.A. This was accomplished by the 1947 Truman Doctrine, the 1948 Bogota pact, and the 1954 Act of Caracas. If we invaded Cuba without consulting the Organization of American States we would surely incur the enmity of the very countries we are trying to save from Castro. Obtaining their approval is presently impossible, as evidenced by our recent failure to obtain from that organization no more than a mild rebuke and warning to Castro when he announced his Communist stand.

Cuba is also called a military threat and is reported as being built up as a missile base. Sena-

tor Hubert Humphrey, who recently visited with the Fleet Task Force near Guantanamo, stated (Congressional Record, Sept. 11, 1962) that "It is misleading and mischievous to say that Cuba represents a military threat to the United States. Castro can triple or quadruple his imports of Soviet technicians and arms without requiring us to assign a single additional destroyer or fighter squadron to our Caribbean Forces."

CASTRO undoubtedly has ideas about exporting his ideology. Where countries are in such desperate straits that a social upheaval was brewing before Castro, that may happen without any push by him. But we are not standing by idly. The Alliance for Progress is a powerful force to thwart this threat. Its effectiveness is not yet such as to produce expressions of glee, but it will prove in time to be powerful medicine. We can count on our CIA to keep informed on all Castro moves abroad in the interim.

Should Senor Castro try to export his ideology by force, then, I believe President Kennedy would have no hesitation, and he would obtain OAS approval, to carry out this previously expressed intention:

"The Castro regime will not be allowed to export its aggressive purposes by force or the threat of force. It will be prevented by whatever means may be necessary from taking action against any part of the Western Hemisphere."

LET US NOT LOSE our perspective nor overindulge in self-righteousness. The United States has missile bases in Turkey, closer to Russia than Cuba is to the United States. This has caused no hysteria in either country.

Finally, I want to urge again that we not undercut the President. This is a time, as Mr. Warburg puts it, "for patience and fortitude — for wisdom and restraint — for these will serve our country better than boastful threat and bluster."

MAX BLOCK,  
 86 Parkway West